



**FORM PTO-1449 TO BE FILED WITH
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

U.S. Department of Commerce	:	Atty. Docket No.: OSU 1159-059H
Patent and Trademark Office	:	Serial No.: 10/649,056
	:	Filing Date: August 27, 2003
INFORMATION	:	Applicant: Epstein, et al.
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	:	Group Art Unit: 1774
BY APPLICANTS	:	Examiner: Yamnitzky

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

Examiner's Initial	Document Number	Date	Name	Class/Sub-class
<i>MEY</i>	5,137,991	08/11/1992	Epstein, et al.	525/540
<i>MEY</i>	5,247,190	09/21/1993	Friend, et al.	257/40
<i>MEY</i>	5,663,573	09/02/1997	Epstein, et al.	257/40
<i>MEY</i>	5,739,545	04/14/1998	Guha, et al.	257/40
<i>MEY</i>	5,804,917	09/08/1998	Takahashi, et al.	313/504
<i>MEY</i>	5,920,080	07/06/1999	Jones	257/40
<i>MEY</i>	5,962,962	10/05/1999	Fujita, et al.	313/412
<i>MEY</i>	5,965,979	10/12/1999	Friend, et al.	313/504
<i>MEY</i>	6,069,443	05/30/2000	Jones, et al.	313/504
<i>MEY</i>	6,150,668	11/21/2000	Bao, et al.	257/40
<i>MEY</i>	6,198,092	03/06/2001	Bulovic, et al.	250/214.1
<i>MEY</i>	6,465,953	10/15/2002	Duggal	313/553
<i>MEY</i>	6,469,437	10/22/2002	Parthasarathy, et al.	313/504
<i>MEY</i>	6,522,067	02/18/2003	Graff, et al.	313/512
<i>MEY</i>	6,558,820	05/06/2003	Raychaudhuri, et al.	428/690
<i>MEY</i>	6,566,806	05/20/2003	Kawai	313/504
<i>MEY</i>	6,576,975	06/10/2003	Yang	257/499

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

Examiner's Initial	Document Number	Date	Country/Name	Translation yes/no
<i>MEY</i>	WO 99/07189	11 Feb 1999	PCT	—
<i>MEY</i>	WO 99/55121	28 Oct. 1999	PCT	—
<i>MEY</i>	WO 01/17319	8 March 2001	PCT	—
<i>MEY</i>	WO 01/78163	18 Oct. 2001	PCT	—

class/subclass

— —

— —

— —

— —

Mani R. Yamnitzky July 08, 2004

OTHER DOCUMENTS

1. NONE

Examiner	Date Considered
----------	-----------------

Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

See Page 1 M/Ry

07/08/2004

The identification of any document herein is not intended to be, and should not be understood as being, an admission that each such document, in fact, constitutes "prior art" within the meaning of applicable law since, for example, a given document may have a later effective date than at first seems apparent or the document may have an effective date which can be antedated. The "prior art" status of any document is a matter to be resolved during prosecution.